15 (T)

TICOM/X-25

TOP SECRET

INTERROGATION OF FIVE MEMBERS OF THE RLM/FORSCHUNGSAMT ("GOERING'S FA") AT SCHLOSS GLUECKSBURG, NEAR FLENSBURG ON 15th AND 21st JUNE 1945

The following four civilians were transferred from the RLM/FA to OKM, 4 SKL III on 16th May 1945, where they worked until arrested on 23rd May 1945:-

(a) Dr. Martin PAETZEL: said to be in charge of a section devoted to breaking of codes, since 1933.

(b) Regierungsrat Otto FINGERHUT: said to be in charge of the evaluation of information, since 1937. Before then studied Scandinavian languages at Greifswald University.

(c) Regierungsrat Hoeckley ODEN: said to be in charge of the technical apparatus, since 1936. Before then with Siemens and Halske.

(d) Dr. Heinz KLAUTSCHE: said to be in charge of dissemination of information to the various interested agencies, since 1936. Before then studied business at various universities.

In addition, the following official of the RLM/FA was interrogated:

Min.Rat SEIFERT: In charge of the Intelligence Section of the Forschungsamt.

Attached are reports of their first and second interrogations. All five are being held for further investigation. It has been reported that the F.A. were also responsible for the Nazi Party monitoring Service.

TICOM
5 July 1945

No. of Pages 9

Distribution:

British
Director
D.D.3.
D.D.4.
D.D.(N.S.)
D.D.(M.W.)
D.D.(A.S.)
A.D.(C.C.R.) (2)
Lt.Col. Leathem

U.S.
OP-20-G (2) (via Lt. Pendergrass)
G-2 (via Lt.Col. Hilles)
S.S.A. (2) (via Major Seaman)
Director, S.I.D. ETOUSA (2) (via Lt.Col. Johnson)

TICOM
Chairman
S.A.C. (2)
Cdr. Bacon
Cdr. Mackenzie
Cdr. Tandy
Lt.Col. Johnson
Lt.Cdr. Manson
Major Seaman
Lieut. Eachus
Lieut. Vance
Captain Cowan
Lieut. Fehl
TICOM Files (2)

Additional
S.A.C. (2 extra for Lt.Cdr. Davenport and Section V)
Major Morgan
Dr. Pickering

TOP SECRET

FIRST INTERROGATION - SCHLOSS GLUECKSBURG - 1715/15th JUNE 1945

Subjects: Min.Rat. SEIFERT
Reg.Rat. ODEN
Dr. PAETZEL
Reg.Rat. FINGERHUT
Dr. KLAUTSCHE
} RLM/Forschungsamt

Present: Cdr. Dudley-Smith, R.N.
Major Morgan, I.C.
Major Seaman, U.S. Army
Lt.Cdr. Davenport, R.N.V.R.
Lt.Cdr. Forster, R.N.V.R.
Captain Royffe, I.C.
Lieut. Kirby, U.S. Army
Lieut. Morley, R.N.V.R.

Q.1 What were the general functions of the Forschungsamt?

SEIFERT: Our duties were general interception of traffic, decyphering, and the provision of intelligence obtained from this material. We intercepted both W/T and Cable traffic. I was Head of a Section of the Forschungsamt and when the main body of the organisation went South I came North to organise the interception of Broadcast and Press Traffic.

Q.2 What were your original duties?

SEIFERT: I was responsible for the editing of the intercepted material into the form of reports.

Q.3 Describe the organisation of the Forschungsamt.

SEIFERT: It consisted of six Sections:-

1. Organisation
2. Personnel
3. Technical and interception
4. Decypherment
5. Intelligence
6. Technical matters (equipment)

The Director of the Organisation was Min. Direktor Schapper.

The Heads of the six Sections were as follows:-

1. Min.Rat. Bergeren
2. O.R.R. Kempe
3. Min.Rat. Breuer
4. Min.Dirigent. Schroeder
5. Min.Rat. Seifert
6. O.R.R. Stabenow

Q.4 What types of Cypher were worked on?

SEIFERT: The traffic of any country for which we had material. We preferred cable to W/T traffic because the groups were less corrupt. We were concerned with diplomatic traffic only, but the traffic of military attachés was not dealt with. We handled unrecyphered commercial traffic but no work was done on the cyphers of industrial concerns, banks, etc. We worked on economic traffic passing between various points in Russia. The only agents' traffic handled was Polish and most of the Polish agents concerned were in Czechoslovakia.

Q.5 To whom did you supply the intelligence so obtained?

SEIFERT: It was given to all Government Departments including the Foreign Office, OKW (for all services), the Food, Transport, and Propaganda Ministries and R.S.H.A. At some of these departments we had liaison officers.

Q.6 What steps were taken to prevent duplication with other organisations doing diplomatic work?

SEIFERT: In the 10 years since 1933, no one has succeeded in preventing duplication.

Q.7 On what traffic did you obtain your greatest successes?

SEIFERT: Our greatest success was obtained on internal Russian traffic which enabled us to discover the various bottlenecks in the Russian supply organisation.

Q.8 Name other countries on whose traffic you had major success.

SEIFERT: All French unrecyphered books.

Q.9 Was this particularly productive?

SEIFERT: Yes. Because the French used a large number of these books.

Q.10 Any other countries?

SEIFERT: Belgium. They used one book both with and without substitution recypherment. It was read in both cases.

Q.11 What was the strength of your organisation?

SEIFERT: 2500 including the personnel at intercept stations.

Q.12 What was the strength at Headquarters?

SEIFERT: About 1000.

Q.13 What was the strength Section by Section?

SEIFERT:
Section 1 - 150
Section 2 - 80 or 100
Section 3 - 200
Section 4 - 180
Section 5 - 400
Section 6 - 200

[Interrogator's Note: This gives a total of 1230 which is somewhat in excess of his original estimate of 1000]

Q.14 When was the Forschungsamt founded?

SEIFERT: In 1933.

Q.15 Who initiated it?

SEIFERT: It was started by Korvetten Kapitaen Schimpf who committed suicide.

Q.16 Who was the driving force behind your organisation?

SEIFERT: It was started under the Air Ministry with the intention of its being an inter-service organisation.

Q.17 Where did Goering come in?

SEIFERT: The Fuehrer directed Goering to run this organisation. I do not know more as I only joined at the end of 1933.

PAETZEL: I joined at the end of July 1933. The organisation had then been running for two or three months.

Q.18 What work was done on British diplomatic cypher systems?

PAETZEL: Work on these systems was useless and no success was obtained. There was an occasional physical compromise. We captured a clear text and a basic book in Norway but had no success with them cryptographically.

Q.19 What about low-grade systems?

PAETZEL: Traffic in unrecyphered books was attacked and read.

Q.20 Can you give any details of the clear text to which you have referred?

PAETZEL: I cannot remember whether this was ever available, but I remember the basic book.

Q.21 What was the name of the Head of the Section dealing with English traffic?

SEIFERT: O.R.R. Waechter.

Q.22 What work was done on American systems?

PAETZEL: We read U.S. plain systems and afterwards a U.S. system consisting of a five letter book recyphered by Mono-alphabetic and bigram substitution though this was not solved currently. The tables changed within the message and this change was shown by an indicator.

Q.23 How long did you take to read messages after a change of elements?

PAETZEL: We only read back material.

Q.24 How old?

PAETZEL: Several months, sometimes over a year. The successor to this system was not broken because there was no indicator in the middle of the message to show where the tables changed.

Q.25 What other American systems do you know about?

PAETZEL: We attempted a strip system and read it here and there but not currently. We finally gave it up as it took up too many personnel.

Q.26 Do you remember any originators of messages in this Strip system?

PAETZEL: No.

Q.27 Did you read any other American diplomatic traffic?

PAETZEL: No, except that sent in plain book systems.

Q.28 Did you work on Inter-Departmental Cypher?

PAETZEL: I think so but Waechter is the man to ask.

Q.29 Did Waechter also deal with American traffic?

PAETZEL: Yes he did.

Q.30 Was any intelligence of value obtained from British or American unrecyphered codes?

PAETZEL: I cannot remember anything of importance or any instance of an important message being sent in a low-grade system.

Q.31 (to ODEN) When did you join the Forschungsamt and what were your duties?

ODEN: I joined in 1936. Previously I had been an Electrical Engineer and I was responsible for the equipment of Intercept Stations, their maintenance and for certain personnel matters.

Q.32 Do you have Hollerith Machinery?

ODEN Yes.

Q.33 How many machines?

PAETZEL: 1 Alphabetic Tabulator
2 D.11 calculating tabulators
3 or 4 Sorters
1 Reproducer
Many punchers

Q.34 Had you a Karten Mischer "Collator"?

PAETZEL: No.

Q.35 Had you any Machinery other than Hollerith?

PAETZEL: No.

Q.36 (to ODEN) Did you invent any Machinery for similar purposes?

ODEN No.

Q.37 (to FINGERHUT) When did you join the Forschungsamt and what were your duties?

FINGERHUT: I joined in 1937 and worked in many capacities in the intelligence section, finally taking over a sub-section of which I was head until July 1943. I was then in charge of a training school for Evaluators until the end of 1944. Three kinds of intelligence reports were prepared. Our aim was to provide objective and scientific reports without political colouring.

Q.38 (to KLAUTSCHE) When did you join the Forschungsamt and describe your duties.

KLAUTSCHE: I joined in November 1936 and having had a university training in Economics and Politics I concentrated on the economic side, Foreign Armaments, Industries, etc. In 1943 I became Liaison Officer at OKW and was entrusted with the selection and distribution of intelligence to OKM, OKH and OKL.

[Interrogator's Note: All five detainees appeared to be reluctant to produce information which might be expected to be of long-term value to the Allies. It was particularly noted that whilst ODEN was speaking the other four were uneasy]

SECOND INTERROGATION - SCHLOSS GLUECKSBURG - p.m./21st JUNE 1945

Subjects: Dr. PAETZEL
Reg.Rat. ODEN

Present: Major Seaman, U.S. Army
Lieut. Kirby, U.S. Army
Lieut. Nuelsen, U.S.N.R. (later)

[Interrogator's Comment: We were doubtful of the importance of the five F.A. people. It was decided, however, to question these two further, PAETZEL as the only cryptanalyst in the group at Gluecksburg, and ODEN because he had something to do with machines]

I. PAETZEL

Q.39 Can you describe the inner Russian systems which you mentioned the other day?

PAETZEL: I did not work on them myself. They were clear text mixed with cover names.

Q.40 By whom were they used.

PAETZEL: By industrial plants, foundries, plane factories, armaments, machine works and so on.

Q.41 How much traffic was there?

PAETZEL: I don't know.

Q.42 Well, can you form any estimate? Was it one a day, 100 a day?

PAETZEL: It was rather heavy [Long pause] Possibly several hundred.

Q.43 What can you tell us about the Polish agent systems used in Czechoslovakia, that you mentioned?

PAETZEL: I did not work on them myself.

Q.44 Well, were they codes? Substitutions? Transpositions?

PAETZEL: They were not codes [Long cogitation, with involved statement which boiled down to a description of an aperiodic substitution, with the alphabet divided into sections, each having separate components. No information on the key].

Q.45 Have you ever worked on any cipher machines?

PAETZEL: Some time ago we broke the Swiss Enigma for a while, but only when it was improperly used. The same internal settings were used for a long time. After the inner settings changed we did not have any more solution.

Q.46 What was your method of solution?

PAETZEL: At first we reconstructed the wheels from cribs and from the fact that the inner setting remained the same. The messages had cliché beginnings.

Q.47 Did you ever break the Hagelin?

PAETZEL: The messages were never long enough.

Q.48 How long would they have to be?

PAETZEL: Perhaps 5,000 letters.

Q.49 What was the method?

PAETZEL: I don't know. I didn't work on it myself.

Q.50 What kind of traffic did you have?

PAETZEL: Swedish.

Q.51 Did you have Finnish?

PAETZEL: I think so. We had some cribs for one of those two at one time and broke in.

Q.52 Who would know the method?

PAETZEL: Regierungsrat KROEGER. He also did the Enigma work.

Q.53 What was your own work?

PAETZEL: I was the head of a section which dealt with systems which could not be delegated to the pure language sections because of their lack of time and personnel.

Q.54 Did you do cryptanalysis yourself?

PAETZEL: Seldom, as I was the boss.

Q.55 What have you worked on yourself lately?

PAETZEL: Spanish additives.

Q.56 Were you successful?

PAETZEL: Yes.

Q.57 Can you describe the systems?

PAETZEL: They differed according to traffic link. Each link had 10 tables, with 100 four-digit groups on each table. The indicator was the serial number [He did not know how it worked]. It came in the 2nd or 3rd place.

Q.58 Was it enciphered?

PAETZEL: I think it was in the clear, as it did not cause much difficulty.

Q.59 What other Spanish traffic did you have?

PAETZEL: None. Some links had more tables than others.

Q.60 What else have you worked on lately?

PAETZEL: Japanese.

Q.61 What was that like?

PAETZEL: It was a transposition with nulls over a two and four letter Code.

Q.62 What was the indicator system?

PAETZEL: It was rather complicated. I don't know.

Q.63 When did you work on this system?

PAETZEL: In the middle of 1943 [To ODEN: it was before the 1st of November, wasn't it?]

Q.64 What happened on the 1st of November?

PAETZEL: The whole establishment was completely destroyed by bombing.

Q.65 Where was this?

PAETZEL: In Berlin-Charlottenburg.

Q.66 Was the Japanese system read?

PAETZEL: Not currently.

Q.67 How late?

PAETZEL: We read it for about six months, but never currently.

Q.68 What other Japanese systems did you work on?

PAETZEL: We started to work on Japanese again in January 1945 but did not solve anything.

Q.69 What kind of system?

PAETZEL: We thought the system was basically the same.

Q.70 Did you work on Chinese traffic?

PAETZEL: Yes, but not towards the end. Some progress was made, but nothing was read.

Q.71 What about Manchukuo?

PAETZEL: It was worked on, but I know nothing about it.

Q.72 Yugoslavia?

PAETZEL: We had success with it.

Q.73 Tito or Mihailovic?

PAETZEL: I think it was Mihailovic.

Q.74 What kind of system was it?

PAETZEL: Five digit or five letter with dinome substitution of the corresponding positions of pairs of code groups. Probably five digit.

Q.75 What about Rumanian?

PAETZEL: The Rumanians were very conservative. They used a five digit code plus substitution. It was very, very simple.

Q.76 Greek?

PAETZEL: Just two plain codes were read.

Q.77 Bulgarian?

PAETZEL: The systems were basically a few five digit codes with repaginations or relineations.

Q.78 Hungarian?

PAETZEL: They used an additive changing within the message. It was not solved.

Q.79 Arabian states, such as Saudi Arabia?

PAETZEL: We did not work on them. Does Saudi Arabia have its own systems? We did a little work on an Ethiopian code.

Q.80 Portuguese?

PAETZEL: They were five digit codes and we read them all.

Q.81 Did you work on any Latin American systems?

PAETZEL: We read all the Mexican and some smaller countries like Costa Rica, Paraguay, and Venezuela.

Q.82 What were the systems?

PAETZEL: Usually they were periodic substitutions. Mexico had codes.

II. ODEN

Q.83 What work did you do on the security of German cipher machines?

ODEN: None. I only worked on the maintenance of Forschungsamt communications.

Q.84 Did you have your own intercept stations?

ODEN: Yes.

Q.85 Where were they?

ODEN: They changed from tine to tine.

Q.86 Where were they on 1st January 1945?

ODEN: At TELPLIN, 70 km. North of Berlin; LUEBEN in the Spreewald, 65 km. South of Berlin. These were the main ones. There were others at COLOGNE, KONSTANZ, EUTIN, and GOLS near Vienna.

Q.87 How many sets?

ODEN: 100 to 150 at each of the first two; 20 to 30 at each of the others.

Q.88 How was the traffic forwarded?

ODEN: By cipher teleprinter.

Q.89 What model?

ODEN: T.52

Q.90 a, b, c, d, or e?

ODEN: c, d, and e.

Q.91 Did you develop your own intercept equipment?

ODEN: Usually not. We worked with the Army, the Reichspost and industry. We only got our own equipment if we felt we were not getting what we wanted.

Q.92 Did you work on the improvement of the T.52?

ODEN: Only as an engineer with Siemens/Halske before I came to FA. At FA I worked with others to some extent on their engineering weaknesses.

Q.93 Did you have liaison with Wapruef 7?

ODEN: Not formally. Some of its employees were classmates of mine.

[Comment: The interrogations have been put in question and answer form, as far as they can be reconstructed from our notes, in order to give some idea of the unsatisfactory nature of the replies. In fact, each reply of PAETZEL's required several restatements of the question in various forms, which we did not record, and was forthcoming only after long reflection.]